

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 and 14-16 are currently pending; Claim 13 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; Claims 15 and 16 were added; and Claims 1 and 7-12 are amended by the present amendment. The changes and additions to the claims do not add new matter and are supported by the originally filed specification, for example, on page 18, lines 14-23; and page 24, line 24 through page 25, line 12.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1 and 6-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayakawa et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0154187, hereafter “Hayakawa”) in view of Hu et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0143727, hereafter “Hu”) and Srinivasan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,856, hereafter “Srinivasan”); Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayakawa in view of Hu, Srinivasan, and Anderson (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,401); Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayakawa in view of Hu, Srinivasan, and Gautam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,704, hereafter “Gautam”); and Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayakawa in view of Hu, Srinivasan, and further in view of Debique et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0184180, hereafter “Debique”).

With respect to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to Claim 1 overcome this ground of rejection.

Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

displaying information corresponding to the
modified number of columns, received from the
update-information providing apparatus, that is
related to the content data, the content data being
audio content that is reproducible at the

communication terminal, and the columns in the table format of the database schema corresponding to information about the audio content.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hayakawa is directed to a method of synchronizing application data stored in databases of a plurality of information processing devices. At most, Hayakawa discloses that a PC 300 converts item identifiers (IDs) of all items stored in a PC database 300a into ID numbers, and then transmits items, converted ID numbers, and edit instruction information to handheld information terminal 200. *See, e.g.*, paragraph [0100] of Hayakawa. Applicants respectfully submit that Hayakawa fails to disclose or render obvious modifying columns, let alone “displaying information corresponding to the modified number of columns, received from the update-information providing apparatus, that is related to the content data, the content data being audio content that is reproducible at the communication terminal, and the columns in the table format of the database schema corresponding to information about the audio content,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Hu and Srinivasan fail to cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Hayakawa. In this regard, Hu is directed to converting the Digital Imaging and Communications in Medicine Structured Reporting (DICOM SR) standard to a set of Extensible Markup Language (XML) Document Type Definitions (DTDs) and XML Schemas. *See, e.g.*, paragraphs [0004] and [0010] of Hu. As previously set forth, Srinivasan is directed to a method for representing objects in a relational database in which new rows, but not new columns, may be inserted into a table. *See, e.g.*, column 6, lines 37-39 of Srinivasan. In the *Response to Arguments* section of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner asserts column 8, lines 45-51; column 14, lines 60-65; column 15, lines 1-20; and FIG. 5 of Srinivasan as disclosing “modifying columns while data content is located in the database.” In this regard, Srinivasan is submitted to disclose adding a new attribute type to

an object class and modifying an existing object class by editing an appropriate subschema entry. Applicants respectfully submit that Srinivasan does not describe that the plurality of content data remains stored in a consistent state in the database, while the subschema entry is being edited. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that Srinivasan were properly considered as disclosing that “updating the database schema includes at least modifying a number of columns in the table format of the database schema while the plurality of content data remains stored in a consistent state in the database,” and Applicants submit that it is not, Applicants respectfully submit that Srinivasan fails to disclose at the amended features of Applicants’ independent Claim 1. Neither Hu nor Srinivasan disclose or render obvious displaying information corresponding to the modified number of columns, that is received from the update-information providing apparatus, and that specifies audio content data. Accordingly, Hu and Srinivasan fail to disclose or render obvious “displaying information corresponding to the modified number of columns, received from the update-information providing apparatus, that is related to the content data, the content data being audio content that is reproducible at the communication terminal, and the columns in the table format of the database schema corresponding to information about the audio content,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Debique, which was cited with respect to Claim 13, certain features of which are incorporated into amended Claim 1, is submitted to disclose that metadata is typically associated with only one source (*e.g.*, a source CD) and if a user “rips” the same song to a file on a local hard drive and plays that song back, then the metadata corresponding to the file is displayed. Debique further discloses that any changes made (*e.g.*, by the user) to the metadata corresponding to the CD are displayed to the user only when the song is played back directly from the CD, and any changes made to the metadata corresponding to the file are displayed to the user only when the song is played back from the file. Applicants

respectfully submit that Debique merely disclose that a user makes changes to metadata. That is, Debique does not disclose “displaying *information corresponding to the modified number of columns, received from the update-information providing apparatus*, that is related to the content data, the content data being audio content that is reproducible at the communication terminal, and the columns in the table format of the database schema corresponding to information about the audio content,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

In view of the above, none of Hayakawa, Hu, Srinivasan, and Debique disclose or render obvious, “displaying information corresponding to the modified number of columns, received from the update-information providing apparatus, that is related to the content data, the content data being audio content that is reproducible at the communication terminal, and the columns in the table format of the database schema corresponding to information about the audio content,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 1 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over Hayakawa, Hu, and Srinivasan, either alone or in proper combination.

Anderson, Debique, and Gautam have been considered but fail to remedy the deficiencies of Hayakawa, Hu, and Srinivasan with regard to Claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over Hayakawa, Hu, Srinivasan, Anderson, Debique and Gautam, either alone or in proper combination.

Independent Claims 7-12 recite features similar to those of Claim 1 discussed above. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 7-12 patentably distinguish over Hayakawa, Hu, Srinivasan, Anderson, Debique and Gautam, either alone or in proper combination.


The present amendment also sets forth new Claims 15 and 16 for examination on the merits. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully submitted that these more detailed

features are not disclosed or rendered obvious by Hayakawa, Hu, Srinivasan, Anderson, Debique and Gautam, either alone or in any proper combination. Applicants respectfully requested an indication of allowance with respect to Claims 15 and 16 at least for depending from Claim 1, which Applicants submit has been shown to be allowable.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested. Furthermore, the examiner is kindly invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the phone number below to resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Sameer Gokhale
Registration No. 62,618